

THE
JOURNAL OF THE
ROYAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL INSTITUTE
OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

Volume 100
Part 1
January 1970
Published by the
Royal Anthropological Institute
of Great Britain and Ireland
21, BEDFORD SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.1

The Editors: Sir John Huxley and Sir Kenneth Murray

David Hunter, Secretary, Royal Anthropological Institute

Subscription prices for 1970: £12.00 (UK) and £14.00 (overseas) for institutions; £6.00 (UK) and £7.00 (overseas) for individuals. Single issues: £1.00 (UK) and £1.20 (overseas). Orders, which must be accompanied by payment, may be sent to a bookseller or to the Royal Anthropological Institute, 21, Bedford Square, London, W.C.1.

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION

1919

A. O. LEVATOR (<i>Philosophy</i>)	Johns Hopkins University
VICE-PRESIDENT	
H. A. AUSTIN (<i>Philosophy</i>)	Western Reserve University
SECRETARY	
H. W. TUCKER (<i>Mathematics</i>)	Massachusetts Institute of Technology
TREASURER	
WILLIAM HAYDOCK (<i>Mathematics</i>)	University of Cincinnati

For the term ending December 31, 1919

M. M. ABBEY (<i>History</i>)	Dartmouth College
H. B. BOHLEN (<i>Law</i>)	University of Pennsylvania
R. COHEN (<i>Philosophy</i>)	College of the City of New York
S. DUBILA (<i>Philosophy</i>)	Northwestern University
D. DURAND (<i>Philosophy</i>)	University of Minnesota
W. FARNAM (<i>Economics</i>)	Yale University
J. D. Mc FORD (<i>Spanish</i>)	Harvard University
B. B. GREENE (<i>History</i>)	University of Illinois
LUCY M. SALMON (<i>History</i>)	Vassar College
A. B. WHITMAN (<i>Economics</i>)	University of Texas

For the term ending December 31, 1920

CARL BLASUS (<i>Physics</i>)	Brown University
E. E. HATCH (<i>English</i>)	Syracuse University
JOSEPH B. HANCOCK (<i>English</i>)	Smith College
WALTER G. HUNTER (<i>German</i>)	Holyoke College
E. DE STAMBUCK (<i>Philosophy</i>)	State University
B. B. DAVIS (<i>Chemistry</i>)	University of Kansas
W. M. PRINE (<i>History</i>)	University of Nebraska
L. L. LILLIGE (<i>Science</i>)	Stanford Jr. University
M. MORSE STEPHENS (<i>English</i>)	University of California
A. A. SMITH (<i>Political Science</i>)	University of Washington

For the term ending December 31, 1921

LAWRENCE BASSON (<i>Geology</i>)	Wrentham College
W. E. ACKMAN (<i>Statistics</i>)	University of Kansas
JOSEPH GALT (<i>Physics</i>)	Northwestern University
M. DODGE (<i>German</i>)	Washington University
WILLIAM JACOBY (<i>German</i>)	Columbia University
H. C. LANCASTER (<i>French</i>)	Amherst College
O. G. LIGHT (<i>History</i>)	University of North Dakota
E. S. MURRY (<i>History</i>)	University of Washington
W. P. TULLOCK (<i>English</i>)	Stanford Jr. University
H. M. WHEELER (<i>Philosophy</i>)	University of Michigan

For the term ending December 31, 1922

H. WILSON (<i>Law</i>)	Western University
FRANK TAYLOR (<i>Philosophy</i>)	Cornell University
M. COLEMAN (<i>History</i>)	University of Chicago

For the term ending December 31, 1923

W. O. GALT (<i>Chemistry</i>)	University of Michigan
W. O. GALT (<i>Chemistry</i>)	University of Michigan
W. O. GALT (<i>Chemistry</i>)	University of Michigan
W. O. GALT (<i>Chemistry</i>)	University of Michigan

VOLUME V

MARCH, 1919

NUMBER 3

BULLETIN

OF

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
General Announcements.....	3
New Plan for Meetings of Local Branches.....	5
Pensions and Insurance.....	7
Report of Committee R—Promotion of Research.....	11
Report of Committee S—Organization and Conduct of Summer Schools.....	18
Report of Committee U—Patriotic Service.....	29
Report of Committee V—Apparatus for Productive Scholarship.....	35
Notes from Local Branches.....	40
Nominations for Membership.....	43

GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

The present BULLETIN contains four important committee reports, two of which were presented at the Baltimore meeting. The report of Committee U was prepared for presentation at the same time, and that of Committee V was presented informally, but has since been considerably expanded.

COUNCIL BUSINESS.—The Council has voted to approve the proposal of affiliation of the Association with the American Association for the Advancement of Science. This does not imply any change of policy whatever in regard to the time and place of meeting, or in regard to maintaining equally close relations with other national societies. It has been suggested that the next meeting be held at Cleveland in connection with the December meeting of the American Historical Association.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS.—It is hoped to publish a complete list of committees in the next BULLETIN.

The Executive Committee is now studying the problem of finding chairmen for Committees A (Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure) and O (Requirements for the Ph.D. degree).

Information in regard to the suspension of Professor Louis Levine at the University of Montana, "for insubordination and unprofessional conduct, prejudicial to the welfare of the University" has been published in numerous periodicals (for example, in *The Survey* for February 22). The Association has already taken action in the matter. At the request of the President and the Acting Chairman of Committee A, Professor F. S. Deibler of the Department of Economics in Northwestern University left for Montana on March 17, to represent the Association, and to collect material for a report, if a satisfactory settlement is not reached.

Requests have been sent to chairmen of committees, which have presented reports, asking them to advise the officers what further steps, if any, ought to be taken in connection with their reports, either by way of publicity or other special methods of making recommendations effective.

UNITED STATES BUREAU OF EDUCATION.—The Secretary's Office has received from the United States Bureau of Education a copy of BULLETIN, 1918, No. 20, on "Resources and Standards of Colleges of Arts and Sciences," being the report of a committee representing the Association of American Universities, the Association of State

Universities, the American Medical Association, the Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education, the Association of American Colleges, and several regional associations, colleges and preparatory schools. The report gives for 233 colleges of arts and sciences (for the academic year 1915-16) tabulated information on the following topics: admission requirements; requirements for degrees; endowment and income (indebtedness); an analysis of the advanced degrees held by members of the faculty; the number of students and their distribution by classes; the ratio of courses announced in the catalogue to those actually given; the annual appropriations for laboratories and libraries.

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES.—The March BULLETIN of the Association just received, contains a brief report of the annual meeting at Chicago, a statement from President Cowling of the work of the American Council on Education, the vote of the Association approving the permanent organization of the American Council and an account of activities in connection with the establishment of a Federal Department of Education, with International Relations, etc., a discussion of the attitude of the colleges on academic credit for war service and on the probability of returning to the pre-war semester calendar.

The report of the annual meeting is followed by the report of the Executive Secretary on the year's work of the Association, with special discussion of international reciprocity, giving the details in regard to French students brought to American colleges and the publicity work in Washington for the American Council on Education. The report also includes a short statement in regard to co-operative purchasing for colleges and the furnishing of information in regard to college teachers available for appointment.

The Association includes at present 250 members. The President for 1919 is President William A. Shanklin of Wesleyan University, the Secretary-Treasurer, President Raymond M. Hughes, Miami University.

COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY SALARIES.—Inquiry comes from a local branch as to any published information which may be available in regard to recent efforts to raise college and university salaries. Mention is made in School and Society for March 8th of salary readjustment at Washington and Lee University and at Lafayette College. Further information on the subject may be forwarded to the Secretary's office.

NEW PLAN FOR MEETINGS OF LOCAL BRANCHES

Plans for 1919 have been submitted in the following circular letter to members of the Council and transmitted in duplicate to chairmen of local branches:

"The President of the Association submits for the approval of the Council a plan intended to accomplish the following purposes:

(a) To bring about general and more careful examination and discussion of important committee reports by the members of the Association;

(b) To obtain a more representative expression of the opinions of members upon the recommendations of these reports than can be obtained at an annual meeting;

(c) To give greater coherency to the work of the Association, by focusing the attention of members, in any one year, upon a limited number of specific questions of educational policy;

(d) To correlate more closely the programs of the meetings of local branches with the work of the committees of the Association, and thereby to give greater interest, definiteness and vitality to the activities of the branches.

"The plan proposed is as follows:

1. The Council shall, as early in the year as possible, choose not more than three subjects as the principal subjects for consideration by the Association during the year, both in the meetings of local branches and at the annual meeting.

2. These subjects shall in all cases be identical with subjects, or parts of subjects assigned to standing or special committees for report; and, as a rule, only subjects upon which reports, or preliminary reports, have been, or are soon to be, published in the *BULLETIN* shall be designated as the special subjects for the year.

3. When the special subjects have been chosen by the Council, the Secretary shall notify chairmen of local branches, and shall, in the name of the Council, request that at least one meeting of each local branch during the year be devoted to each of the subjects designated.

4. Chairmen of committees whose reports are up for special consideration during the year shall be invited by the Secretary to formulate specific questions which may be submitted to local branches for their discussion and for the expression of their opinion,

any action thereon taken by these branches to be communicated to the committees concerned and to the Secretary of the Association, and to be reported at the ensuing annual meeting.

5. At the annual meeting, time shall be set aside for the discussion of the special subjects for the year.

6. Nothing in this plan shall be understood as preventing either the annual meeting or the local branches from dealing with any other subject which they may desire to discuss or to vote upon.

"As this plan could not be made binding upon future Councils without a constitutional amendment, it is for the present proposed for adoption for this year only. If successful, the plan will doubtless be continued by future Councils from year to year.

"In order to save time, members of the Council who favor the plan are asked to vote also upon the special subjects for the current year. If the plan is adopted, these should be announced in the next issue of the BULLETIN. The President recommends that the two following subjects be those designated for 1919:

1. *The Recruiting of the Profession*, with special reference to the present system of graduate fellowships and scholarships (Committee C, Professor G. E. Barnett, Chairman; preliminary report published in BULLETIN, April, 1918).

2. *The Promotion of Research in Colleges and Universities*. (Committee R, Professor W. A. Nitze, Chairman; report published in this BULLETIN (page 11); and Committee V—Apparatus for Productive Scholarship—Professor F. J. Teggart, Chairman; report published in this BULLETIN (page 35)."

This plan, including the selection of the above subjects, has been adopted by the Council.

PENSIONS AND INSURANCE

Since the publication of the Report of Committee P, with Supplementary Statement, in the January-February issue of the BULLETIN, various matters relating to subjects dealt with in that report have come before the Chairman of the Committee and the President of the Association. The more important new facts concerning the plans of the Teachers' Insurance and Annuity Association of America are here brought together for the information of members.

I—PROPOSED SYSTEM OF COMPULSORY CONTRIBUTORY ANNUITIES

The plan for compulsory annuities, referred to in the Supplementary Statement, in the last BULLETIN (pp. 35-42), has been withdrawn by the Carnegie Foundation. The President of the Foundation, on February 26, 1919, addressed to the presidents of colleges and universities a letter containing the following:

"Conferences with officers of the colleges have brought out the fact that while these institutions assent quite generally to this [compulsory] principle, some of them regard the matter of obligatory or voluntary participation of newly entering teachers as one to be determined by the college itself as a condition of its own service. They desire also that such of their teachers as may enter upon the contributory plan shall participate in the benefits provided under the new rules—and particularly in the disability benefit—whether their participation be upon an obligatory or upon an optional basis. In view of this expression of opinion, the matter has been taken up afresh by the executive committee and by the trustees of the Foundation, and I am directed to inform you that the Foundation will accept a participation in the contributory plan on the part of the associated colleges whether the college decides to make participation on the part of teachers obligatory or optional."

This communication makes it evident that the opposition to the compulsory contributory plan announced in the Foundation's circular of December 6, 1918 (see preceding BULLETIN, p. 35-36), was so great that the Executive Committee of the Foundation found it advisable to abandon the project.

It is, however, to be observed that the Foundation still adheres to the other provisions of its new rules, and in particular to the second of the features to which objection was made in the Supplementary Statement (p. 38): *viz.*, to the plan of offering disability insurance, and apparently an additional interest of $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent on premiums, out of the funds of the Foundation, in violation of the understanding that these funds were to be set aside for the purpose of fulfilling, as nearly as practicable, the legitimate expectations of

teachers entitled to pensions under the rules in force in 1915. In this connection, attention may be called to the circular letter of President Pritchett to presidents of colleges and universities associated with the Foundation, in which the new rules were originally announced:

"The inspection of the rules as printed in the enclosed statement will make clear that while teachers entering the associated colleges in the future will not receive full paid pensions directly from the Foundation, these teachers will continue to receive privileges of great value, among which is a pension, granted after five years of service, in case of complete disability, based upon a surrender to the Foundation of the teachers' deferred annuity policy. This provision meets a serious need not dealt with under the former rules.

"It will be understood that the great endowment of the Foundation remains untouched. The income from it will be used for many years chiefly in paying the pensions of teachers now in the associated colleges. As this income is released, it will be devoted to the advancement of teaching in the colleges and universities of America along such lines as the trustees may judge to be wisest. The colleges and universities associated with the Foundation will continue to have certain great privileges by reason of that relation."

It still remains the case, therefore, that the present rules of the Foundation anticipate the offering of certain privileges to institutions placed upon the Foundation's "associated list," which privileges will be conferred upon one set of teachers at the expense of another set of teachers (usually in the same institutions) who have in equity a prior claim.

If the Carnegie Foundation sincerely desires to meet its obligations to the men eligible under the former rules, in accordance with its undertaking officially made to this Association, November 21, 1918, it should be made clear that the income of its original capital, with both interest and capital of the recently added reserve fund, are to be devoted without deduction to their original purpose, and not held back for such ulterior objects as are suggested in the recent letter of the President of the Foundation.

II—NON-PARTICIPATING CHARACTER OF THE POLICIES OFFERED BY THE TEACHERS' INSURANCE AND ANNUITY ASSOCIATION

The Report of Committee P (BULLETIN V, pp. 30-31) called attention to the fact that the charter of the new company provides that the corporation shall "transact business exclusively on the non-mutual basis and shall issue only non-participating policies"; and that the contracts actually offered by the Association accordingly contain the clause: "This policy is issued on the non-participating plan. It is not entitled to participate in the surplus of the association."

The President of the new company, however, since the publication of the report of Committee P, has, in public addresses, and in letters to individual members of the committee, stated in substance that

the only way by which the Teachers' Insurance and Annuity Association of America could be organized and authorized to do business under the laws of the State of New York was by limiting its policies to the non-participating form. The chairman of the Committee desires to state to members of the Association that he does not accept as valid the assertion that the new company could not have been organized under the laws of New York and authorized to write participating policies. It would have been entirely practicable for the company to offer insurance at rates of premium which would include sufficient loading to meet the expenses of the company, at the same time issuing participating policies which would give the policyholders a legal right to demand the equitable distribution of the surplus earnings of the company, including the interest upon its endowment as well as the surplus earned from its insurance business. If any special difficulty were experienced, during the early years of the history of the company, in complying with the requirement of the law that participating companies shall pay expenses and maintain their reserve out of premiums before any dividends are declared, this difficulty could have been met by incorporating in the contracts of insurance the provision that no dividends would be paid until two or three years after the policy had been issued. The chairman of the Committee is also informed by competent legal and insurance authorities that, as an alternative to the above method, there would probably have been no difficulty in securing an amendment to the insurance laws of New York providing in substance that, when an insurance company was not operated for profit, as provided by its charter, and when the capital and surplus had been contributed to the corporation by its stockholders, the income from such capital and surplus should be an offset to the expenses of the corporation in fixing the amount of loading.

The chairman of the Committee has seen no satisfactory explanation why one or the other of these plans was not adopted, or why one of them should not be adopted at this time; and he sees no reason to modify in any respect the conclusions on this subject expressed by Committee P in its report.

III—CORRECTIONS IN REPORT OF COMMITTEE P

Certain typographical errors in this report as published in the January-February BULLETIN should be corrected as follows:

Near the foot of page 28, the sentence beginning "If the holder," and the following sentence, should have appeared as a separate paragraph, following the last paragraph on page 29.

In the second paragraph on page 33, the reading should have been: "The committee would regard any attempt by institutions to designate the particular company in which teachers shall invest their savings," etc.

On page 36, paragraph (a) should read: "The Foundation will provide from its income," etc.

Correction should also be made of the reference to Dean Nicolson, of Wesleyan University, as "a former trustee of the Carnegie Foundation."

IV—GROUP INSURANCE

Members of the Association interested in the question of teachers' insurance should bear in mind that several companies are now offering group insurance for university and college faculties at rates considerably lower than their ordinary rates to individuals. Further information about this form of insurance, with comparison of terms, may be expected in the next BULLETIN. A member of Committee P has written as follows to the Secretary concerning the advantages of this plan:

"One attractive feature of the proposed arrangement between colleges and the new Teachers' Insurance Company (managed by the Carnegie Foundation) is the monthly payment of premiums in a lump sum through the treasurer of the college. That plan saves trouble to teacher and treasurer alike, in case the college has agreed to bear some definite part of the cost. Also it centralizes responsibility for keeping the insurance valid as per agreement. It seemed at first not certain that the other insurance companies would consent to a similar arrangement. This question has now a definite answer from one of the strong, old-line companies. Where twenty or more teachers from one institution take such forms of insurance as it offers, it will agree to transact all the business through the college treasurer, by monthly payments. Its policies, by the way, while not exact duplicates of those put out by the Teachers' (Carnegie) Company, are excellent of their kind, and contain a substantial provision for disability.

"It is morally certain that other companies will follow their lead, so that institutions deciding on this complete contractual protection will have the option of a large variety of policies and companies."

PRELIMINARY REPORT OF COMMITTEE R ON THE PROMOTION OF RESEARCH IN COL- LEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

[Presented at the Annual Meeting, Baltimore, December 28, 1918.]

The Committee on Research, whose questionnaire was published in the May BULLETIN, 1918, p. 7, offers the following tentative report:

It is abundantly clear that research in the natural sciences that have an immediate practical bearing has been stimulated by the war. Now that the war is over and the period of reconstruction has begun, this will doubtless have an effect on our universities, whose administrations do not need to be reminded that a physicist or a chemist or a botanist can accomplish little of permanent value unless the opportunities for original work are not only maintained but enlarged. The public itself has been made aware as never before that investigations in physics, in chemistry, in agriculture, in medicine are indispensable to human welfare; and it is improbable that any of these subjects will lack either funds or facilities for research work.

To a considerable extent, this is true also of such branches of study as economics, sociology and history. The money and the labor questions, the problems involved in the reorganization of society, the ethnology and history of European nations, the "causes of the war," and so on are too important to permit of indifference or neglect on the part of our universities.

On the other hand, the humanistic subjects, which include of course those aspects of history, law, etc., that do not bear directly on the problems of reconstruction, run a far greater danger. Where the subject has a utilitarian, practical aspect—for example, modern languages—the tendency will probably be to "investigate" that phase of it which can be made pedagogically available. In this respect, the attention now given to research in *phonetics* in many places is doubtless symptomatic. The British Parliamentary Report of the Committee on Modern Languages shows the direction in which the pendulum will probably swing. Nevertheless, who will be so bold as to affirm that one subject possesses a practical value and another not, however utilitarian the former may seem? We can no more afford to neglect the past than we can the present, if our information is to be sound. The value of knowledge will naturally vary in kind and degree, although when and to what extent it will be practically useful, no one can possibly predict. Our Secretary of State has recently said:

In a conflict so universal as to involve the whole earth, new impulses of human action have been set in motion, not only in the political, industrial and commercial spheres, but in the structure of society and the spiritual life of mankind. . . . With all this we must reckon.

Obviously the "spiritual life of mankind," if it means anything, signifies everything that has contributed to make it what it is, and here Greek and Latin, Sanskrit and Hebrew, ancient as well as mediaeval and modern history, Egyptology, Russian, etc., are concerned.

The Committee wishes, therefore, to reaffirm the fact that research in all branches of knowledge is indispensable, particularly so now when it behooves mankind to view its problems more than ever *sub specie aeternitatis*. The Committee believes that the liberating quality of research is "an intuition or an axiom"—to modify slightly the statement of one of its members. And to this no subject of graduate study can properly be considered an exception. In no way whatsoever should the purely professional or pedagogic aims of our colleges and universities be allowed to discourage or curtail research work.

But the Committee is agreed that the boundaries of graduate work need closer definition. Not in all respects, nor in all universities, is the work of the investigator properly guarded against the encroachments of the utilitarian or professional interest. In many subjects this condition is perhaps inevitable, since the student is primarily bent on preparing himself for the exercise of a profession in which research can have but a comparatively slight part. A strong argument can be made that most professional training is not only benefited by but also contingent upon some practice in original investigation; certainly in courses of study leading to the Doctor's Degree, training in research is a *sine qua non*. It is clear, however, that graduate work of the highest type depends for its success ultimately on the individual professor and the student co-operating productively. The real graduate school has as its object investigation. Whether the research is done in "a course" or "a seminar" or by means of private consultation between the professor and the student, is here beside the question. In any case two essential conditions are necessary: (1) only those qualified by ability and interest should undertake investigation, and (2) the universities should recognize fully the claims of productive scholarship to opportunities and freedom of work. Both conditions, clearly, apply to student and professor alike.

The first of these conditions is a question of principle, whereas both are questions of administration. We all know how difficult it is to carry on an investigation with ill-qualified students or with groups of students, some of whom are either not qualified or not interested. In order to be effective, research must be conducted as an aim-in-itself, and quality not quantity is the important factor. Most of our universities will readily admit this to be true;

some may regard it even as axiomatic. The chairman is acquainted with a department (in a scientific subject) in which the last year of the graduate work consists exclusively of research, under the personal supervision of the professor with whom the student is working and under excellent material conditions. But is this not the exception rather than the rule? And how often it does happen that the administration questions the value of a course, not to say of the professor, merely because the number of students is small and the subject-matter seems abstruse. Doubtless some subjects are better off in this respect than others. The natural sciences, as indicated, seem to fare best. And yet a member of the Committee representing the sciences complains of "the ceaseless grind of tread-mill laboratory work, which . . . the student has to toil through before research is open to him. This would be all right if it were really disciplinary, but it is not; it is for the most part purely mechanical . . . our universities ought in some way to provide for the exceptional person in such fashion as not completely to kill all originality and initiative." Statistics on such matters are very hard to get; at least such statistics as will reveal the true conditions. But it is hardly an exaggeration to say that in many subjects, notably the humanities, the universities still treat the graduate student (even in his second or third year's work) essentially as an advanced "undergraduate" by planning for him courses that are purely informational and not deliberately productive in their nature. It would be folly to attempt to lay down any hard and fast rule in such matters, or to generalize from one or two cases. But it should be useful to point out the fact and to suggest a corrective. And the corrective is the fuller recognition than is the case at present of the *selective principle* for graduate work. Our university administrations should by every means possible, official and other, encourage the professor to work with *select* bodies of students. In more branches than at present the professor in charge of graduate work should be made to feel that this is his first and main duty or function.

As for the second of the above conditions, it will evidently be difficult or indeed impossible to put the selective principle into operation unless our universities draw a sharper line between undergraduate and graduate students as such. In fact, it might be well to distinguish three classes: (1) undergraduates; (2) professional students; (3) graduate students. However that may be—and it is again impossible to legislate *en bloc* as to how much research work, if any, the professional student should have, inasmuch as most if not all of our graduate students are preparing for a profession—it yet seems manifest that a rigid division between undergraduates and graduates is not only desirable but necessary. The Johns Hopkins University as originally planned did this very thing. What militates against its realization at present in the opinion of the Committee, is, in large part at least, our present "course" or "credit" system.

To quote a passage from a letter of one of the Committee, himself an administrator, the situation may be summed up in these somewhat drastic terms:

The general tendency of the exaggeration of administration in American educational institutions is to treat a university like a factory. If we have got to choose I should be more inclined to say it should be treated like a monastery. At any rate, I am sure that so far as our graduate work is concerned we must be delivered from the mechanism of courses, office hours, and all that sort of thing, which belong to manufacturing institutions and not to institutions of learning.

Or as another member, also an administrator says:

Residence at a university should be defined in terms of attendance upon courses, but should imply no more than attendance and payment of fees. All course credits should be abolished, so that there will be no possibility of a student receiving a degree by the accumulation of such credits. The scholarship requirements for the degree should be defined independently of the residence requirement. They should be defined in terms of the subject-matter.

Granted—but how can a reform here be brought about? Most of our administrators will say that the “course-credit” serves the useful purpose of estimating the degree of preparation and the type of information the student possesses or should possess, and that it is difficult to estimate this in any other way. Besides, it will be said that the individual professor is always free to make his own evaluation of the student’s ability—independently of “course-credits”—and to communicate this information to others.

In reply to these objections, the Committee would point out that, admitting the correctness of the above contentions, it is nevertheless true that in the mind of the student the present “course” or “credit” system has taken on an importance quite out of proportion to its real value—at least for graduate work. It is in order to correct this attitude on the part of all concerned but especially the students, that the committee makes the following suggestion:

In each department of our universities there are two or three or more professors who direct research. Let these professors, singly or as a body, testify as to the student’s equipment, not on the basis of courses but with reference to the candidate’s intellectual promise as an investigator. The method by which this information is procured will necessarily vary: it may be obtained through formal examination, or by conferences with all the registered graduate students, or by some other means. The important thing is that a department, after a certain lapse of time—say a year as the minimum—should be prepared to say to the corresponding department in another university: so-and-so is or is not in our opinion fitted to do research work. The committee admits that in many cases this procedure, or what amounts to it, is already in practice. But the point is, and on this the Committee is a unit, it is not the officially recognized procedure, and that it ought to be. In this way, and only in this way, will it become the rule to consider graduate work in terms of mental attainment and promise and not as a mere matter of courses passed or failed.

Believing that this reform is capable of realization, the Committee thinks further that the research student, once accepted as such, should be granted greater freedom to choose his courses than other students. If this is the general practice in some universities, it is not the case or only in part the case in others. As to the library in particular, where the research student should be given every possible facility, much improvement along specific lines is doubtless still possible. The Committee assumes that Committee V (On Apparatus for Productive Scholarship) will deal with the library question. At the same time, we would point out that the research student should have ready access to the shelves; that he should have a study- or work-table next to the books, and that, as one member of the Committee suggests, the university librarians should seek to establish—perhaps through the Carnegie Institution—"some central bureau of information through which one might easily find out if and where in the United States a given book is to be found." Our present library exchange, helpful as it is, does not and cannot provide this feature, which in itself would greatly facilitate our research work. Material is available to show that in general our university libraries could more effectively than at present serve the special university needs. A university library is a public institution in a restricted sense only. It fulfils its purpose best when it provides the means for specialist work. It should, therefore, contribute in every manner possible to further investigation in those subjects for which the university stands. And this is possible only if our library staffs possess a real knowledge of books, of bibliographical aids, of the resources of the library itself, and a disposition to place them at the service of the investigator under the most favorable conditions, over and above the attention and the energy now devoted to cataloging and preserving the acquisitions that the library makes. A university library, it may be said, is a "workshop" and not primarily a system of catalogs or a repository of printed material.

As to the question of publication, here again Committee V will doubtless have useful things to say. On our part we would suggest that the channels of publication could be greatly improved in two directions:

- (1) By strengthening the support of existing journals of recognized merit. This could be done by direct subsidy in certain fields, either from several universities as a group or from several learned bodies working in co-operation; and

- (2) By the franker recognition on the part of the Carnegie Institution of research in the field of the humanities. Much would be gained if this body would publish a series of treatises or articles too long for our journals to publish and too unremunerative for the general trade. Or, if the Carnegie Institution is unavailable, then the separate university presses might combine in order to subsidize and publish such series. Moreover, the "miscellaneous" type of

publication now maintained by some of our universities might thus be discontinued and the funds set free thereby devoted to this central agency, which would operate under proper editorial supervision.

In conclusion, the Committee makes the following recommendations:

(1) That the universities be asked to recognize their research students—that is, their graduate students whose capacity for research has been tested and approved—as a distinctive group, to be designated as such. This need not imply that other students should be excluded from research courses. On the contrary, such courses must be readily accessible for the purpose of testing the student's ability. At the same time, there should be a clear-cut division between those students whose capacity is admitted and those whose capacity is still untried.

(2) That for such students a statement of knowledge and ability—like the French *certificat d'aptitude*—be issued through the graduate dean by the department in which the student is doing research work, this statement to be given preference over the present system of "course-credits," which for purely administrative reasons can hardly be abolished but to which less importance should be attached.

(3) That in universities in which it is not yet the case, such students be accorded practically the same library and laboratory facilities as the professors with whom they are working—including in each case a study-table in the library. That, further, the university libraries be urged to give greater attention to the special needs of research students, in such a way that the libraries shall be administered in behalf of investigators rather than of the general reader.

(4) That the media of publication be strengthened in the directions indicated above.

The Committee has purposely approached the question of research from the point of view of the student and the facilities offered him for work. There remains the fundamental question of research in relation to the professor, which the Committee feels is equally important. But as this involves the problem of a better classification of professors into various groups, the research and the teaching types, and the further distinction between genuine universities and those that are mainly or entirely professional schools, involving also the important matter of promotions and salaries, it was deemed advisable to leave the question of research as regards the professor for a later more detailed report. For the present at least, it will be admitted that if the facilities for research are improved along the lines treated in the report the position of the professor engaged in research will necessarily be bettered. And from this it will be but a step to proceed to a fuller recognition of the just claims of the research professor, both in respect to opportunity for work and to

adequate recognition by way of promotion and salary. So, too, an improved method of assigning "fellowships" could be worked out in connection with the above plan, but with this the Committee did not feel called upon to deal at present.*

The Committee:

E. C. ARMSTRONG, Princeton University
CARL BECKER, Cornell University
MAURICE BLOOMFIELD, Johns Hopkins University
A. C. L. BROWN, Northwestern University
A. R. HOHLFELD, University of Wisconsin
E. P. LEWIS, University of California
J. L. LOWES, Harvard University
F. C. NEWCOMBE, University of Michigan
W. A. OLDFATHER, University of Illinois
ROSCOE POUND, Harvard University
C. C. TORREY, Yale University
F. J. E. WOODBRIDGE, Columbia University
WM. A. NITZE, University of Chicago, *Chairman*.

* The discussion of the report at the Baltimore meeting by Professor Lovejoy brought out a point which it seems wise to comment on here. Mr. Lovejoy said: "If we are to maintain anything that genuinely deserves the name of graduate work we must set ourselves rigorously against a tendency to which many institutions are tempted—that of having sham graduate schools. We ought to make clear to executive boards of all institutions that profess to carry on graduate work for more than a year or two, that such work, honestly done, means having a special faculty devoted exclusively, or almost exclusively, to graduate instruction and research; and we should emphatically urge that this kind of work should be attempted only by universities having funds and equipment sufficient to enable them to carry it on in this manner." This idea is voiced also by at least two members of the Committee. Professor Oldfather says: "An effort might well be made to define a 'standard' graduate school, as a standard college and a standard high school have recently been defined. This should tend to concentrate graduate instruction at the points where it can be conducted effectively, and should discourage institutions with inadequate resources from professing to give graduate instruction." And Professor Hohlfeld writes: "I should like to see a suggestion that we have *far too many* institutions attempting to make Ph.D's. If we had twenty or even twenty-five real universities carrying their students to a Ph.D. degree whereas the others were satisfied to have *strong* M.A. courses, we should be infinitely better off. And until we have a clearer classification of institutions and professors, all attempts to emphasize research may do more harm than good. The very men and institutions that ought to do strong, effective teaching (by no means only 'informational' in character) will, I fear, be the first to try to prove their belonging to the select by going off on the research tangent."

The idea involved in these suggestions if carried out would require: (1) a survey of existing universities with reference to research facilities; (2) a classification of such universities as fit or unfit to give graduate instruction, in all departments or in some departments; (3) the acceptance by the universities of the results of the survey and the fuller recognition by them of "graduate schools," as distinct in aims and methods from their "colleges" and "professional schools."

REPORT OF COMMITTEE S ON SUMMER SCHOOL ORGANIZATION

[Presented at the Annual Meeting, Baltimore, December 28, 1918, for future discussion and action.]

The purpose of the investigation conducted by your committee is to ascertain the effect of the summer school, as an institution, upon certain essential activities and interests of the university, more particularly its effect upon (1) research, and (2) salaries and promotions.

The subject not readily lending itself, in its more important aspects, to a purely statistical inquiry, the committee's method of work has been in the main the collection of opinion. For this purpose a small group of representative teachers, who have had experience in summer teaching, or have carefully observed its effect upon others, was chosen from each of seven representative institutions, and each teacher in each group was then asked to express himself frankly and somewhat informally upon certain specified topics. This body of opinion has now been assembled and analyzed and, with the conclusions drawn from it, is presented below. Although the number of persons interrogated was relatively small, your committee believes that the opinions obtained are typical, and hence that a further extension of the inquiry would not materially change the character of the data.

The questions asked and the answers, in summary, are as follows, the institutions concerned being indicated by capital letters:

I. What is the general attitude of your faculty toward the summer school?

(A) In the main favorable. It is agreed, at any rate, that the summer school is a good thing for the teachers who attend, and that it is a convenience for students who want to shorten their college course. A defect of the summer school is that it allows students to acquire credits too cheaply. By thus lowering the standard of requirements for the A.B. degrees it tends to become a refuge for incompetents.

(B) In the main distinctly favorable, a marked tendency in this direction having come about within a few years. (A small though emphatic minority holds that the summer school as at present conducted is harmful to both teachers and students.)

(C) Favorable on the part of those who have taught in the summer school, indifferent or adverse on the part of those who have not. Those who oppose the summer school, do so on the ground (1) that it absorbs more time and energy than a productive scholar can give to it, and (2) that little effective work can be done in such concentrated courses.

(D) Favorable. "No red tape, no faculty meetings, no wasted days; indispensable; of very great value; the best semester of the year; vacation too long," are some of the comments. The only notable objections concern the effect on research and the degradation of the summer session to an advertising device in some institutions.

(E) Mildly favorable.

(F) Favorable to the summer school as a means of shortening the course, but hostile to it as a means of making up delinquencies.

(G) Partly favorable, on the ground that the summer courses keep the plant in use, give teachers an opportunity for advanced work, and make possible an exchange of teachers and of ideas; but mainly adverse because they drain the teachers' energies.

II. What is the character and grade of scholarship of students who attend the summer school as compared with the character and scholarship of students in other sessions?

(A) The extremes of age and scholarship are greater in the summer school and call for a more individual kind of teaching. The better summer school students are as good as those of the regular session; the poorer are often exceptionally poor.

(B) Superior because the students are older and in general more seriously intent upon their work. Teachers from the high schools pursuing graduate work are apt to show somewhat less resiliency of mind.

(C) No inferiority.

(D) Little difference.

(E) Under-graduates not so high in scholarship, but graduate students higher.

(F) The standing of summer school students is at least as good as that of the students in the other terms.

(G) Summer school students show a more earnest attitude, but are not so stimulating to the teacher.

III. In what particular ways does the summer school promote or hinder research?

(A) On the whole the summer school is detrimental to research, because it absorbs the time and energies of those who might otherwise carry on investigations during the summer. The advantage gained from visiting new places and coming in contact with new men is probably not so great as that lost on account of absence from one's own library, collections, etc. The balance here will differ greatly according to the subject of research, and the institution visited. It must be said, however, that there is a tendency in all academic circles to exaggerate men's potentiality for research. As a matter of fact, most college professors will not under any circumstances do much, if any, research of consequence. It appears to be largely an administrative problem, to arrange matters so

that those whose researches are important shall not, from pressure of necessity or other reasons, be led to abandon their researches to teach in summer school. Such men, however, may very well give a certain number of lectures to the great advantage of the school and with no detriment to their researches. Also a man may remain in his own institution, carrying on his investigations, and welcome a certain number of advanced students or colleagues from other schools.

(B) The answer depends upon the individual. A teacher who is interested in investigation will continue his work whether he is teaching in the summer school or not, and the teacher who is not interested will not use to that end the time put at his disposal.

(C) The summer school promotes research among the students, but can scarcely be said to further research on the part of those engaged in instruction, except in so far as it calls scholars from the smaller institutions to the larger, where library facilities are greater.

(D) Opinions conflict. On the whole, the staff think that they and their acquaintances are prevented from research, though the money earned in the summer school often frees men from petty work and worries during the year. They agree that the summer school recruits effectively for regular research work, since many of the best Ph.D. candidates came in the first instance to the summer session.

(E) Summer work is a hindrance to research on the part of the average instructor.

(F) Experiences differ; much depends on the climate.

(G) The summer school promotes research, by bringing scholars to the university who could not otherwise attend, but hinders research by using up the limited nervous energy of the teacher and especially by breaking in upon his hours of continuous labor.

IV. How much time in the summer school is given to preparation for class work that would otherwise be spent in research?

(A) Not very much, for the summer courses are usually based on the winter courses; but even the repetition may use up a great deal of nervous energy. Account must also be taken of the attendant committee and administrative work.

(B) Depends on the individual.

(C) Normally slight, although the drain on the energies of the instructor prevents his accomplishing as much in the way of research as he otherwise might. On the other hand, some instructors are probably stimulated in their studies by not more than two hours of teaching daily.

(D) Opinions conflict. See answer to III.

(E) Summer work is generally a hindrance, though the giving of a graduate course may stimulate research on the part of the instructor.

(F) No definite opinion.

(G) Little time spent in preparation, but a great deal in conferences with students, reading papers, etc.

V. How much time in vacation is ordinarily given to research by those who do not teach in summer school?

(A) No definite answer can be given, but it is certain that the majority do no significant research. When the summer is not used in teaching, it is likely to be spent in travel. Some spend the summer in gainful occupations other than teaching.

(B) Individuals differ widely, but the trend of opinion is that teaching in the summer session makes very little difference in a man's output. An opinion contra is as follows: "I have invariably, when not engaged in summer session work, given approximately two-thirds of my vacation to research and writing. When I teach in the summer school I have little heart or energy at the end thereof for either of these occupations. I presume that my case is rather typical."

(C) The personal equation is a large factor. It so largely determines the time given to research in vacation by those who do not teach in the summer school, that it is difficult to say whether those not engaged in teaching will accomplish more than those who are so engaged. It is a fact that about one-half of those employed in summer school work would do no more in research if they were not so engaged. It is also a fact, that a considerable proportion of instructors in any college accomplish but little in the way of intensive study during the vacation periods. The more energetic and industrious instructors will keep busy during the summer whether engaged in teaching or not. Those who are not teaching should theoretically have more time for research, but it is extremely doubtful, if, in the majority of cases, they avail themselves to the full of that leisure.

(D) Opinions conflict. See answer to III.

(E) No answer.

(F) Individual experiences vary.

(G) Wide variation in individual cases. One instructor spends three or four hours a day for four or five days of the week throughout the summer in writing or studying.

VI. Does success in summer school work aid in securing either promotion or increase of salary?

(A) As a rule no appreciable effect.

(B) No known instances, though it is the opinion of one, at least, that the summer school retards increases of salaries for the stronger men.

(C) Only in cases where the instructor is called as a summer school teacher to a larger institution.

(D) Some report ignorance of the matter. Others feel sure that it does not. Apparently success in summer school primarily decides whether the man shall be continued in summer school teaching, but only indirectly affects his reputation in relation to his regular post in the institution.

(E) The general opinion appears to be that the existence of the summer session is a hindrance to increase of salary; that the average board of trustees believes that the opportunity to increase one's income by summer session work is a sufficient reason for avoiding increases in salary to parallel increases in the cost of living.

(F) No effect upon either salary or promotion.

(G) Opinions differ, but no instances can be cited.

VII. Have the salaries of the summer school any effect upon the general salary scale? Are they taken into account in questions of promotion or increases of salary?

(A) No distinctly observable effect.

(B) Inevitably.

(C) If the instructor's summer work is done in the same institution in which he teaches during the winter, the salary paid for it is undoubtedly looked upon by the administration as part of his total emolument, and, in a sense, his summer work may not be advantageous to him in securing promotion or increase of salary. Our Engineering College maintains its session for eleven months out of the twelve, and it is a fact that professors who teach in the Engineering College for eleven months and also in the College of Arts during nine months, while being credited on the eleven-month basis, are not paid quite proportionately.

(D) No specific cases, though a certain suspicion seems to be present in men's minds. Some teachers assume summer school work as a part of their general obligation at the time of their appointment. If found sufficiently valuable in research they are freed from summer school work without diminution of salary.

(E) No answer.

(F) No definite opinion.

(G) In negotiating with candidates for positions, opportunity to teach in the summer session is sometimes offered as an inducement.

VIII. What remedies can be proposed for the existing evils of the summer school?

(A) (1) More adequate salaries, though this would deprive the summer session of some of its ablest teachers. (2) Discrimination between important and unimportant research, where possible, the former to be safeguarded by removing the difficulties in the way of those who would perform it. (3) Employment, for the summer session, of men whose sole business will be not teaching but research.

(B) (1) Make it unprofessional to accept for full-time work in the summer school a lower scale of salary than prevails the rest of the year. (2) Pay to teachers who are clearly research men and productive scholars an increase in salary equal to the amount which they would earn in the summer school. (3) Forbid research men to teach the year round or to teach more than two out of three summers; in other words, adopt the Chicago system.

(C) (1) Limit the summer session to six weeks. (2) Reduce the instructor's work to two hours a day. (3) Make special efforts to maintain scholastic standards.

(D) (1) Make the minimum salary one-sixth of the regular salary (for six weeks), and compel rest from summer school work one year in seven. (2) Eliminate all summer schools save those which can maintain a large offering, and thus obtain classes of a size that will pay for adequate salaries. (3) Abandon the present self-support plan for summer sessions. Endow them or subsidize them liberally. Maintain research as well as routine instruction.

(E) No answer.

(F) No answer.

(G) Increase salaries and shorten instructors' hours of teaching in the regular sessions.

IX. What positive action on the part of the Association can be recommended?

(A) (1) Present to administrative authorities the importance of research. (2) Determine in some objective way the value of current researches with reference to their probable future efficiency, and urge that the men conducting them be given every facility.

(B) See VIII.

(C) See VIII. Recommend that the salary schedule of summer work be kept wholly distinct from that of the work done during the remainder of the year.

(D) See VIII.

(E) No suggestion.

(F) No suggestion.

(G) Appoint a committee to consider fully the working conditions of the instructor with reference to research.

To the opinions cited above may be added the data assembled in the following tables. For the accuracy of the figures the chairman of the committee is alone responsible.

TABLE I

RATIO OF SUMMER SCHOOL TEACHERS TO TEACHERS IN OTHER SESSIONS

Institution	No. of Local Teachers in S. S.	No. of Outside Teachers	Percentage of Outside Teachers	No. in Regular Faculty*	Percentage of regular Fac. in S.S.
Cornell.....	52	22	30	467	11
Case.....	11	76	14
Pennsylvania.....	69	10	13	479	14
Harvard.....	57	13	19	385	15
California.....	65	71	52	428	15†
Colorado.....	46	18	28	200	23
Minnesota.....	147	11	7	639	23
Illinois.....	92	5	5	392	23
Tennessee.....	33	45	57	134	25
Missouri.....	62	1	2	239	26
Wisconsin.....	154	5	3	525	29
Oregon.....	25	8	28	83	30
Kansas.....	81	5	6	258	31
North Carolina.....	25	23	48	71	35
Alabama.....	10	48	82	27	37
New York.....	75	33	31	188	40
Michigan.....	169	11	6	409	41
Ohio.....	76	5	6	174	44
Nebraska.....	51	1	2	114	45
Indiana.....	106	19	16	229	46
Columbia.....	326	68	17	697	47
Texas.....	94	14	13	184	51†
Iowa.....	88	14	14	141	62

* Does not include faculties of law, medicine, engineering, etc., unless such departments are represented by courses in the summer school.

† Omitting the second term, consisting solely of war emergency courses.

‡ The summer session is divided into two terms. Those who teach in one term do not teach in the other.

TABLE II
ROUND-THE-YEAR TEACHING

No. of Years of Consecutive Teaching	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18		
Institutions															Total No. of Round- the-Year Teachers	Percentage S. S. Faculty
I.....	5	5	7	4	2	4			1	1					29	18
II.....	2		1				1								4	3.7
III.....	3	1	4		1	3				1					13	29.4
IV.....	1	2	8				3								14	21.7
V.....	3				1										4	3.9
VI.....	8	11	1	2	3	1	1				1				28	27.4
VII.....	2	2	6		3	1	1	1			1	3	1	1	22	23

From the preceding summaries and individual expressions of opinion the following conclusions may be drawn:

1. The attitude of observant and experienced teachers at representative institutions is on the whole favorable to the summer courses, though mainly in the interest of persons who would otherwise be cut off altogether from university privileges.

2. Students in summer courses, while they show greater extremes of ability, are not, in general, inferior to students in other courses.

3. With regard to the effect of the summer school on research, although opinions conflict, the general drift seems to be that summer courses as now organized in most institutions are distinctly harmful, mainly because of the drain upon the investigator's nervous energy. The extent of the evil depends in a measure, however, upon the individual, some teachers being able to pursue research in connection with their teaching, others not. Round-the-year teaching for long periods of years is permitted at many, perhaps most, institutions, though it is acknowledged to be an evil in itself as well as inimical to research. It does not appear that the rise of the summer school has thus far actually diminished the scholarly output, however much it may threaten to do so.

4. There is a general suspicion that the summer courses work adversely to increases of salary and to promotion, but no specific data have come to the attention of the committee.

In view of these conclusions your committee would make the following specific recommendations:

1. That in the selection of teachers for summer courses, administrative officers should consider in each case how the appointment will affect the productive scholarship of the institution.

2. That no teacher should be allowed to teach the year round for more than four years in succession.

3. That in fixing salaries and determining increases of salary, the amount paid for summer school work should either be reckoned invariably as a fraction of the year's salary, or should be consistently disregarded. It should never, that is, be viewed as compensation for insufficient salary.

4. That no institution should pay less for summer school work than the sum which it pays for the same kind and amount of work in any other session.

The Committee:

F. W. CHANDLER, University of Cincinnati
T. D. A. COCKERELL, University of Colorado
S. P. DUGGAN, College of the City of New York
T. C. ESTY, Amherst College
M. B. EVANS, Ohio State University
G. D. HADZSITS, University of Pennsylvania
W. M. HART, University of California
D. C. MUNRO, Princeton University
*G. C. SELLERY, University of Wisconsin
MARION TALBOT, University of Chicago
E. L. THORNDIKE, Columbia University
J. H. WIGMORE, Northwestern University
F. N. SCOTT, University of Michigan, *Chairman*.

THE QUARTER SYSTEM

(The so-called quarter system of the University of Chicago, since it virtually eliminates the summer school as a separate entity, falls outside the scope of the committee's inquiry. It is, however, a related subject and one that recent events in war and education have brought sharply to the attention of university teachers. For these reasons the following extracts from a letter by Dean James R. Angell, presenting quite frankly and impartially the advantages and disadvantages of the system, seem both timely and pertinent.—F. N. S.)

"The question divides itself naturally into two main considerations: First, what are the effects upon the student body, and upon the general outside constituency of the university; and second, what are the effects upon the members of the faculty?

"As regards the first point, I think the general feeling is that the

* Professor Sellery withholds his signature on the ground that he has not been able, through lack of time, to take part in the Committee's investigations.

Summer Quarter is an unequivocal advantage. It may possibly serve to tempt some students to overwork, but this danger is trifling as compared with the wide and important advantages which many of the students gain from the ability thus to expedite the completion of their collegiate training. It is also unquestionably a great boon to thousands of teachers who desire to come into actual contact with the regular work of a great university. I can have no question that the fact that our Summer Quarter has always been an integral part of our regular work, and not a mere appendix to the same, has given us a marked advantage over institutions where the work of the summer has been conducted in a spirit of apology and compromise.

"The number of undergraduate students who have studied for three consecutive Summer Quarters, although in residence during the remainder of the year, and thereby have taken the bachelor's degree in three calendar years, is extremely small. The number of such students who have made use of the Summer Quarter to make up deficiencies, whether occasioned by ill health or by other causes, is relatively large, and the opportunity has been particularly valuable to students who for financial reasons may have been obliged to drop out for a few months to earn money.

"On the other hand, graduate students, working toward the doctor's degree, are very apt to remain the year around until the course is completed, taking no vacation except that in September, which the present program of the university permits. (Although originally the university divided the year into four equal quarters, conducting an academic period of twelve weeks to the quarter, and introducing a week's vacation between successive quarters, the present program involves a slightly different distribution of time. The larger part of the month of September is employed for purposes of general renovation of the buildings and the institution is closed for about three weeks. The vacation break between the Spring and the Summer Quarter is entirely eliminated.)

"A grave difficulty in the maintenance of a twelve-week Summer Quarter consists in the fact that a considerable part of the students who desire to attend are engaged in teaching in the public schools, or in other institutions which close appreciably after the opening of the university's Summer Quarter (now occurring generally about June 20-25), or which open in the autumn before the completion of the summer work. The division of the Summer Quarter into two periods of six weeks each, does something to mitigate this difficulty, but it is a constant and a serious source of embarrassment, and should be frankly faced. Were the usages of the schools at all uniform, a fairly satisfactory adjustment could be made, but the university draws from all over the country, and the practices to which it must accommodate itself are extremely varied.

"As regards members of the faculty, the situation is much more dubious and complex. Speaking from my own experience, I should

say that many men are tempted in a most unwise degree to overstrain their physical powers, in order to increase somewhat their financial income, or to gain longer subsequent vacation periods.

"I assume that you understand that we pay for work in excess of three quarters either in cash at a discounted rate, or in terms of accrued vacation at full rates.

"Over against these dangers, is to be set the fact that, during the summer, students of mature and often admirable training come into residence, and in many departments afford the instructor opportunities to do advanced work with an excessively stimulating class of people. Such an experience is to many men highly valuable, and goes far to offset the depressing and staling effects from over-fatigue. You will again understand that because a man works during our Summer Quarter, it does not follow that he is doing more than three quarters work. Many of our men prefer to take their vacation period at some other time of the year, and work during the summer.

"There can also be no question that the university as a whole gains intellectual strength, as well as repute, from the presence during the Summer Quarter of eminent men from other institutions. The effects of this upon the general prestige of the university are not to be underestimated. It serves also to bring the members of the faculty into pleasant personal relations with a wide range of influential men of distinction.

"Over against these advantages are to be set the disadvantages of trying to fit into the methods and standards of the institution, the peculiar prejudices and traditions of such visitors. It is quite unusual that the instructional work of such men compares in efficiency with that of the members of the regular staff, unless such visitors have been at the university on two or three different occasions.

"Summarizing, then, I should say that for members of the faculty the work of the Summer Quarter contains a very serious danger, which ought to be closely watched by administrative authority. There is some danger also for a student who may be persuaded to work himself stale when his permanent result would be better if he interrupted his work with a vacation. But, on the whole, the advantages of the system so far outweigh the disadvantages that one can hardly question the permanency of the institution."

REPORT OF COMMITTEE U ON PATRIOTIC SERVICE

[Prepared for the Annual Meeting, Baltimore, December 28, 1918.]

Circumstances have combined to make the report of this Committee hardly more than tentative. Former reports have been able to discuss matters in some general way, but since the appointment of the present chairman the situation in which the colleges have found themselves has been abnormal. The establishment of the Student Army Training Corps and its speedy dissolution, the signing of the armistice with its effect upon the morale of the entire student body, the prevalence of the influenza which compelled the closing of many institutions, have combined to make any form of report difficult.

In gathering material for the report, the chairman asked suggestions from the Secretary of the Association as well as from the members of the committee as to what should be the general field to be covered. It seemed to be the general opinion, that the report should cover three fields: first, the actual contribution of the universities to national service; second, the general effect of the S. A. T. C. and the war situation upon the universities, especially in view of some possible revelation as to the general efficiency of our university system; and third, the steps that should be taken to adapt our university education to the approaching period of reconstruction.

In order to gather the material for a report that should embody anything more than the general opinions of the Committee, a questionnaire was sent to an official representative of the Association in each of the member institutions. This questionnaire covered the three points of interest stated above. The returns which arrived in time to be used in making this report came from approximately one third of the total members of the Association. These returns, however, were fairly representative in that they came from no single locality and from no single type of institution. The opinions expressed and the data given, while not warranting any scientifically accurate presentation of the total situation, are sufficiently representative and uniform to forecast the probable general tendencies

in university opinion and activity. It is to be hoped that the coming year will enable the Committee, if such action seems desirable, to pursue this investigation and obtain a complete and accurate survey of the contributions made by the universities to the national service during the period of the war.

The following results, however, are believed to be sufficiently indicative of representative opinion to warrant their being submitted to the Association. In interpreting the questionnaires it has seemed to your Committee that the inability of institutions to form distinct opinions regarding the possible weaknesses of university education shown by experience during the war, and to forecast changes desirable in the approaching years, are in themselves data of importance.

It should be added that the opinions given on the questionnaire, while occasionally the result of local inquiry, are generally personal, representing as a rule not the opinions of the administrative side of university life, but rather that of professors who in the nature of the case would be particularly sensitive to interests in their own special fields of study.

With these general cautions we submit the following results of our inquiry, omitting the figures and interpreting such statistics as have been gathered as indications of tendencies rather than as possessed of statistical completeness:

I. The universities have been very generally used by the United States government, both for general war work and for the Student Army Training Corps. There have been only a few institutions, and in these the number of men students was not large, where practically the entire plant has not been used by the government. Many of these institutions have been used wholly or in part during vacations as well as during the academic year.

II. The universities report a very general use of members of their faculties by the United States government, both in its military and non-military branches. The number of faculty members who have been used in strictly military service is notable. Second only to this activity has been the use of professors as surgeons and physicians, both on the field and in sanitary, hospital, and ambulance service. Very general use, also, has been made of the departments of chemistry and physics. A considerable number of professors have been used as interpreters, and as athletic directors. A negligible number have been used as chaplains.

Faculty members have been active in practically all of the non-military forms of government service, especially in the State Department, War Department, and Food and Fuel Administrations. A very considerable number have been employed by the Bureau of Public Information, in the general administration of the S. A. T. C., in Draft Boards, and in the National Council of Defense. They also have been used in large numbers in the Red Cross both at home and abroad; in the Y. M. C. A., especially in its educational and administrative service, both at home and particularly abroad. The number used in the Y. W. C. A., the American Library Association, and other forms of non-governmental service, has been considerable.

III. As regards the Student Army Training Corps, the all but unanimous testimony is:

(a) That the effect of the establishment was the practical absorption of the undergraduate body of men;

(b) That the academic work in the S. A. T. C. was distinctly poorer, largely because of the demands of the military officials, with consequent loss of time for preparation. This was of course to be expected, as the S. A. T. C. was not established primarily as an educational, but as a military institution.

(c) That a large proportion of the men who entered the S. A. T. C. were not strictly speaking college men. The estimates as to those who would otherwise not have entered college, run from one-third to one-half of the total number enrolled. In a few institutions the percentage is notably higher, in one case running as high as eighty per cent. In others it would appear that the membership was practically that of the existing undergraduate body, the estimate of those who would not otherwise have been college men running as low as ten per cent in one case, and in other cases between that and twenty per cent.

(d) That the proportion of the S. A. T. C. who would be likely to continue in college is from sixty to seventy-five per cent. The general average would be approximately two-thirds.

(e) That the general effect of the S. A. T. C. upon the educational life of the universities was injurious. A large proportion of the institutions confess to having difficulty with the military control. Very few of them seem to feel that the S. A. T. C. has contributed anything of educational value to our educational system. Such an opinion, however, should take account of the fact that the S. A. T. C. was not given a really fair trial, because of the influenza and the short period which followed the readjustment incident to the establishment of the Corps.

(f) That the details of the S. A. T. C. methods have practically no value for colleges and universities. The four quarter system, the

standardization of work in the sections of the class, and the textbook method, have won practically no favor from those filling out the reports.

IV. The total effect of the war, not including the specific effect of the S. A. T. C., has been on the whole fairly uniform.

(a) There has been a decrease in the attendance of undergraduate men, of men in the graduate schools, and in the law schools. Medical schools seem in some cases to have increased in attendance. As might be expected, the women's attendance has not been greatly affected.

(b) There has been a practical disappearance of all forms of intercollegiate athletics, except football. It is to be borne in mind, however, that football is the outstanding autumn sport.

(c) The general university life and spirit have been seriously disturbed in an overwhelming majority of the colleges. Fraternity life has been almost destroyed, although the sororities do not seem to have been greatly affected.

(d) The effect upon the religious and moral tone of the institutions has been not so uniform. Many universities report an improvement in this regard, and only a small group reports a lowering of morale.

(e) There is all but uniform testimony as to increase of interest in the social sciences, history, Romance languages, and physical and biological sciences. There has been a considerable decrease of interest in classical studies, and a decrease, amounting in many cases to practically a disappearance, in German.

(f) There has been an all but uniform increase of interest in politics and international affairs and in the history of Great Britain, France and Italy. These facts ought to have very considerable attention as indicating what may become a permanent intellectual sympathy.

(g) There has been a very decided increase in favor of military preparation, although this in some institutions seems to have been somewhat weakened by the establishment of the armistice.

(h) The war, with its consequent changes in academic life, is reported to have had on the whole a stimulating and broadening effect upon the professors' lives and habits.

(i) While only one college reports friction between the national groups in the faculty, a considerable proportion of the institutions state that professors were discharged or that they resigned because of pro-German sympathy.

V. There is considerable unanimity also as regards the disclosures made by the experience during war times as to the possible weak-

nesses in our university system. Here, however, it is to be borne in mind that a very considerable proportion of those reporting apparently feel that the time is too short to reach any definite conclusion. Of those who did report, two-thirds deny that the universities have been too remote from life. About the same number deny that university teaching has lacked discipline. A large majority hold that it has lacked emphasis on citizenship. Opinion, however, is all but unanimous that universities have shown themselves readily adapted to the needs of social readjustment.

These opinions are not to be taken as a final formulation of the attitude of university professors. They are, however, provocative of thought as to whether universities are suffering from undue self-complacency.

VI. As regards changes in education which our experience during the war would seem to argue are needed in the approaching period of social reconstruction, the opinion is singularly uniform. Practically all the replies made to the inquiry favor new emphasis on the study of Romance and English languages and literatures, modern and current history, sociology, political economy, political science, philosophy, ethics, literature, physical and biological sciences.

A very interesting group of opinions, again overwhelmingly uniform, is in favor of having prescribed undergraduate courses and curricula. The number of replies dealing with the desirability of general cultural courses and emphasis on research, is not so numerous, but is overwhelmingly in favor. There is also, so far as opinion has been expressed, a uniform belief that there should be special courses preparatory for citizenship. There is all but absolute uniformity in favor of closer relations between the universities of the United States and those of Great Britain and France. Only three of those reporting favor closer relations with German institutions. A considerable number favor closer relations with the Italian and Latin-American institutions.

In reply to the question as to whether extra-mural activities of professors should be favored in times of peace, the replies are almost unanimously affirmative, with a large majority favoring a reduction of class-room requirements in the case of those rendering such service.

One subject upon which there is absolute unanimity is that an increase of salaries is imperative. A corollary to this conviction appears in the very general belief that the teaching profession cannot be made to appeal to the strongest and best students under present

economic conditions, and that graduate students will be drawn away into non-teaching careers.

The opinion as to whether military training should be established in universities is on the whole negative.

The Committee:

M. A. ALDRICH, Tulane University
CHARLES H. COOLEY, University of Michigan
C. L. CORY, University of California
HENRY W. FARNAM, Yale University
ALBERT PARKER FITCH, Amherst College
GUY STANTON FORD, University of Minnesota
LAWRENCE FOSSLER, University of Nebraska
JAMES W. GARNER, University of Illinois
F. H. GIDDINGS, Columbia University
CHARLES H. HULL, Cornell University
CHARLES H. HASKINS, Harvard University
VERNON L. KELLOGG, Leland Stanford Jr. University
GILBERT N. LEWIS, University of California
R. M. McELROY, Princeton University
C. E. MENDENHALL, University of Wisconsin
JULIA E. MOODY, Wellesley College
HENRY R. SEAGER, Columbia University
W. T. SEDGWICK, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
PAUL VAN DYKE, Princeton University
W. H. WELCH, Johns Hopkins University
GEORGE C. WHIPPLE, Harvard University
JOHN H. WIGMORE, Northwestern University
ERNEST H. WILKINS, University of Chicago
A. A. YOUNG, Cornell University
SHAILER MATHEWS, University of Chicago, *Chairman*.

PRELIMINARY REPORT OF COMMITTEE V ON APPARATUS FOR PRODUCTIVE SCHOLARSHIP

[Presented at the Annual Meeting, Baltimore, December 28, 1918.]

This is hardly a report of Committee V, but rather a discussion by the vice-chairman of the aims of the Committee and of the possible means by which these aims may be carried out.

The Committee was appointed for the purpose of promoting the publication in this country of at least some part of that apparatus of scholarship which we have long been accepting as of necessity "made in Germany."

What I mean by the apparatus of scholarship includes three distinct types of publication: (1) Current bibliographies in all the various lines of intellectual work; (2) Annual reports on the progress of studies; (3) Systematic treatises or handbooks on each of the major subjects represented in university teaching.

I. In accordance with the objects for which Committee V was instituted, the first problem which presented itself was that of making arrangements for a series of bibliographies of current literature in the different branches of science and scholarship.

At the outset, however, it became apparent that the great work of the Royal Society, the publication of the *International Catalogue of Scientific Literature*, was something that could not be ignored, more particularly as the Royal Society had taken up the question of a complete revision of the method of publication of the Catalogue.

But if we are debarred, so to speak, from undertaking an *International Catalogue of Scientific Literature*, there remains the equally important and even more significant possibility of creating an *International Catalogue of Humanistic Literature*. Though various international congresses, in Europe in the days before the war, had discussed the desirability of such a catalogue, no such publication exists. If you take the whole field of the humanities, in the broadest sense, you will find many separate, special, current bibliographies, but you will find nothing on a large and comprehensive scale. Moreover, such bibliographies as were in course of publication in 1914 had fallen from two to five years in arrears, while the differ-

ences in methods represented in different publications occasioned much waste of time and effort in their use by students. Furthermore, in the thirty or forty such lists with which I am acquainted, there is a very great amount of duplication in the titles included, while, on the other hand, whole areas of literature are left untouched.

To be specific, the subjects to be embraced in our Catalogue of Humanistic Literature would be Anthropology, Ethnology, Folklore, Archaeology, History, Geography, Philology and Literary History, Classical and Oriental Studies, Religion, Philosophy, Psychology, Education, Economics, Political Science, Sociology—in a word, the varying aspects of one comprehensive and co-ordinated Study of Man. That there should be an index to the literature of man is all the more obvious at the present time when the absorbing interest of thinking people is focused upon the outstanding problems which confront mankind, and it would appear to be an obligation upon scholars to see that these discussions are placed upon the widest and most secure basis. Indeed, it is extraordinary that there should be no available bibliographical source to which we may turn in order to follow the international literature of the questions now occupying the attention of the world; and it would seem that no more substantial contribution to the furtherance of knowledge could be made by American scholarship than the publication of a full and adequate index to the current literature of the problems of mankind.

The aim of the Committee is the creation of an index, international in scope, which would take the place of all such bibliographical aids as have been issued hitherto in the field of humanistic study. The index will be inclusive and comprehensive in the fullest sense, both in regard to subject-matter and to language. The list of periodicals, society publications, and governmental publications to be analyzed will be submitted to specialists in the Association as well as to representatives of the various specialist societies for their criticism and approval. The index will be cumulative, a form of publication rendered familiar by the *Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature*, comprising monthly parts, with an annual bound volume, and a final volume covering a term of years. By this means, the inevitable tendency of all "annual" bibliographies to fall increasingly into arrears will be avoided, and the literature made available when most desired, that is when it has just appeared. By having the bibliography cumulated month by month, it can always be kept

relatively up to date, and the student does not have to wait until late in 1919 for the opportunity to consult the literature of 1918.

Taking up the question of getting the work done, I have gone into the matter in detail with the H. W. Wilson Company of New York, the publishers of the *United States Catalog*, the *Readers Guide*, and several other bibliographical publications of the same type. The bibliography would be announced as under the direction of the American Association of University Professors and the names of the members of Committee V would appear as a guarantee of the scientific character of the undertaking. The entire work would be under the immediate critical supervision of the Association, as represented by this Committee and the members interested in the various special fields included. The whole undertaking would be informed by the idea of making an absolutely sound bibliographical contribution to the study of the subjects represented. On the financial side, it would be understood that the Association incurs no obligation, as the publication would be supported on the basis of subscriptions from universities, libraries, and associations directly interested.

II. The second problem which Committee V has considered is that of providing means for the publication of annual reports on the progress of studies. To be effective in the highest degree such a series of reports should begin with a survey of progress in all the various branches of science and scholarship during the nineteenth century. But whether this historical work be undertaken or not, it seems highly desirable that the publication of annual reports of this sort on a very extensive scale should be encouraged in this country. Naturally, the Association would not undertake to prepare the reports, but it should be in a position to act with a view to obtaining a co-ordinated effort from the various national specialist societies for the production of the reports, and it should be able to arrange for their publication when written. It would seem desirable for the Association to take up the question of the preparation of these reports with the associations representing the various subjects. There appears, furthermore, to be a possibility of the Association being able to arrange for the continued publication of results, perhaps even on a basis of their free distribution.

III. The third type of work with which the Committee has concerned itself is the possibility of procuring the preparation and

publication of extensive handbooks or manuals on each of the greater subjects represented in its program. While in the United States we have brought the high school and college text-book to a high state of perfection, we are entirely deficient in the systematic presentation of broad subjects in a comprehensive manner. So while Germany was using a translation of an American text-book on chemistry when the war broke out, we have had to contemplate the necessity of republishing Beilstein's *Handbuch der Organischen Chemie* in German in the United States as a necessity for winning the war. This is a contrast that requires to be emphasized, for such handbooks, representing the knowledge available on a given subject at a given time, are required for the purposes of teaching in the universities, for the information of the general public, and as a basis for research.

Works of this character, it is obvious, cannot be prepared by the American Association of University Professors. They must be taken in hand by the national associations devoted to the particular subjects, whether chemistry, philology or political science. But our Association, standing as it does for the collective interests of university teachers and scholars, can urge upon the attention of the special associations the need for such works, and it can undertake to arrange for their publication when prepared.

For this type of publication, some organization not at present available would seem to be necessary. It has been suggested that there might be formed a central organization representing the various university presses, and indeed there seems no good reason why universities at present without regularly constituted presses should not be included, to undertake the publication of works too large for any one of them to venture upon singly. There is at the present time a movement on foot with this end in view, but I feel assured that whether this suggestion bears fruit or not the way will be open for the publication of such works when they shall have been prepared. Indeed, what we want most at this moment is specific information in regard to large works of a scholarly nature which have been delayed for lack of means of publication. We all know of some such publications and the Committee needs now all the information available in regard to such works. The time has come, indeed, for trying to convince the people of the United States that our position of relative inferiority in respect to scholarly productivity is not due to lack of resource and initiative on the

part of university men, but is due to lack of money for the publication of large works of a scholarly nature.

In conclusion, may I say that the difficulties in the way of an American army getting to Europe were much greater than anything we are likely to encounter—and the American army arrived. There is no reason why American scholarship should not get to the front in the same way as the American army. Only there is this to be said, that the world is ruled by ideas and not by armies, and we are in a very real sense the guardians of the ideas of democracy.

F. J. TEGGART.

NOTES FROM LOCAL BRANCHES

BRYN MAWR.—The Local Branch makes the following interesting proposition in regard to publication. The financial difficulty of the plan is obviously formidable, but it seems worthy of further discussion.

"The Bryn Mawr Branch has voted to suggest that it would be advisable for the Association to establish a journal in which questions of interest and importance to our profession could be freely discussed.

"In support of this suggestion it is urged that there is at present no medium in which full and free discussion of such topics can be carried on. Occasional articles in popular or semipopular magazines, on the one hand, and the very valuable reports of the various committees of the Association, on the other, are by no means sufficient for this purpose. A journal of the Association would bring together in a continuous nation-wide discussion all who had any significant contribution to make toward the solution of our problems. The committee system of the Association would thus be supplemented without in any way weakening it or depriving it of its independent efficacy.

"Among the questions suggested as falling within the domain of the journal are, first, questions bearing upon the larger policies of the Association itself and its local branches, such as academic freedom, tenure of office, insurance and annuity, etc.; and, secondly, questions relating to the organization of undergraduate and graduate instruction in which university teachers of every department are directly or indirectly concerned.

"It was the general feeling of our meeting that the matter published in the present *BULLETIN* could be included in such a journal which might at first be a quarterly.

"We are aware that our suggestion may be impracticable at the present time, but we believe that the plan has so many advantages that the suggestion is worth making now."

The Local Branch reports the adoption of the following resolution on the matter of a League of Nations:

"*Resolved*, That it is the sense of this Faculty that the great purposes for which the United States entered the War demand that the general principle of a League of Nations be made effective."

COLORADO.—The following resolution in regard to the League of Nations has been signed by members in the University of Colorado.

"In a democracy, law is the mother of freedom. The hard-won gains of the recent struggle can only be held and made fruitful under the protection of law, embodying the ideals and purposes of the most progressive and intelligent portion of mankind. Such law, in its larger features, must necessarily be international, and for this reason we unreservedly support and commend the plan of a League of Nations, and call upon all who desire the well-being of mankind to unite in making it effective."

NEBRASKA.—The Local Branch reports the election of L. E. Aylsworth as chairman.

NORTHWESTERN.—The Faculty of the College of Liberal Arts has passed the following resolution, which has been transmitted to members of Congress:

"Resolved, That it is the sense of this Faculty that the great purpose for which the United States entered the War demands that the general principle of a League of Nations be made effective."

UNION.—The following resolutions are transmitted from the Local Branch:

"The Union College Branch of the American Association of University Professors by unanimous vote has expressed its conviction that a new international organization of the world is an imperative necessity. The attempt to organize the world by giving it a common master has fortunately failed, but it has brought the world into immeasurable calamity. We are heartily in favor of any sincere attempt to create an agency of international co-operation which will bring into action the forces of good will and mutual helpfulness in place of the conflict of selfish interests and national ambitions."

"The Union College Branch of the American Association of University Professors approves the suggestions that the Association should make an organized effort to obtain a stricter observance of the existing entrance requirements in American colleges, and, when necessary, to secure the adoption of adequate requirements in essential subjects. This Branch will support the Association in such a movement."

"With a view to removing the handicap under which many of the preparatory schools now work and bringing pressure to bear on communities which make inadequate provision for the teaching force of their high schools, the Union Branch suggests that the Association should use its influence to secure in the different states the adoption of the following regulation:

"That, in the case of the essential subjects such as English, the languages, the sciences and mathematics, the licenses issued to teachers should specify the particular subjects or departments of knowledge which they are fitted to teach."

"That it is the sense of the Union College Branch that greater opportunity be provided for discussion at the annual meetings of the Association."

VASSAR.—The officers for 1919 are Professor Lucy M. Salmon, Chairman, and Professor Ida C. Thallon, Secretary.

The Branch reports hearty approval of the plan for representation of local chapters by delegates, with the expectation that in this way the Association will have "a very much more live and interesting body for its meetings, and if people feel that they represent their own chapter and will not be swamped in the vote by a large number coming from nearer colleges and universities, they will be much more likely to make the effort to attend the meetings and will carry back from them to their own bodies a stronger impression of belonging to and being a part of the Association."

NOMINATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

The following twenty-eight nominations are printed as provided under Article IV of the Constitution. Objection to any nominee may be addressed to the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass., or to the Chairman of the Committee on Admissions,* and will be considered by the Committee if received before June 15, 1919.

The Committee on Admissions* consists of J. V. Denney (Ohio State), Chairman; Florence Bascom (Bryn Mawr), Edward Capps (Princeton), J. Q. Dealey (Brown), A. R. Hohlfeld (Wisconsin), G. H. Marx (Stanford), and F. C. Woodward (Washington, D. C.).

The names of nominators follow the name of each nominee in parentheses. Nominators for whom no institution is specified are colleagues of the nominee.

G. P. Adams (Philosophy), California,
(S. Daggett, C. B. Lipman, G. R. Noyes)

Robert A. Armstrong (English), West Virginia,
(J. M. Callahan, E. H. Vickers, M. Stathers)

A. G. Baebenroth (English), Syracuse,
(H. A. Tabor, C. H. Carter, A. C. Flick)

Elmer D. Ball (Zoölogy), Iowa,
(L. H. Pammel, H. Osborn, W. M. Barrows, Ohio)

Waitman Barbe (English), West Virginia,
(J. M. Callahan, E. H. Vickers, M. Stathers)

Edwin Fayette Church, Jr. (Mech. Eng.), Brooklyn Polytechnic,
(M. Stathers, West Virginia, C. H. Peabody, H. W. Tyler, Mass. Inst. Tech.)

John Harrington Cox (English), West Virginia,
(J. M. Callahan, E. H. Vickers, M. Stathers)

William R. P. Davey (Greek), Syracuse,
(H. A. Eaton, C. H. Carter, A. C. Flick)

M. S. Dooley (Medicine), Syracuse,
(C. H. Carter, H. A. Eaton, E. P. Knowlton)

Frederick L. Emory (Applied Mathematics) West Virginia,
(J. M. Callahan, M. Stathers, E. H. Vickers)

H. McL. Evans (Anatomy), California,
(S. Daggett, C. B. Lipman, G. R. Noyes)

* Nominations should in all cases be presented through the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.